UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,128	0/566,128 07/19/2006 Rolf-Juergen Recknagel		10191/4080	4205
26646 KENYON & K	7590 12/02/200 ENYON LLP	EXAMINER		
ONE BROADV	VAY	RAO, SHEELA S		
NEW YORK, N	N I 1000 4		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2123	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/02/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/566,128	RECKNAGEL ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Checia i tae	2120
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>13 November 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidav eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH	g date of the final rejection.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exi under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orige than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee jinally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	oliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, leading they raise new issues that would require further contains the conta	nsideration and/or search (see NO	
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or 	•	ducing or simplifying the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.
4. \square The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	-
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 6-12. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ill be entered and an explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attached.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu see NOTE below. 		n condition for allowance because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
/Paul L Rodriguez/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2123		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments made to claim 6 do not change the scope of the invention or do not distinguish the invention from the prior arts of record to be made allowable. Applicant has amended the preamble of the independent claim by merely stating that the data is provided for transmission of sensor values and the sensor values are generated from measured characteristics. This is inherent to the use of sensors and sensor values in general and does not distinguish the instant claims. Applicant argues that the references of prior art fail to teach the dividing of the sensor values for data transmission at different resolutions, as previously indicated Ohl teaches the dividing of data, namely sensor data, for transmission purposes into three different levels of resolution as explained in paragraphs [0012-0014]. Furthermore, Applicant argues that the "Ohl reference does not identically disclose a division of such sensor values ..." there is nothing in the Ohl reference that precludes the division of sensor values in the same way. Then Applicant argues that "the sensor values in the Ohl reference are not divided" and for this reason "cannot be considered to be divided as a function of a variable relevant for the control unit", the Ohl reference clearly states in paragraph [0014] how the sensor values are divided and also indicates that the data is divided for purposes of control. So the references of prior art as used in rejecting the instant claims is maintained and teaches the limitations of the instant claims. Applicant's arguments and/or amendments do not place the claims in better form for appeal nor does it place the application in condition for allowance.